

RESOLVE

Results Through Consensus

720 SW Washington Street, Suite 750
Portland, OR 97205
Ph: 503-228-6408 Fax: 503-228-6207
www.resolve.org

12 December 2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: MLPA San Francisco Regional Working Group Members

FROM: Michaela Ledesma, RESOLVE and Sara Peterson, CA Department of Fish and Game

SUBJECT: September 30th San Francisco Regional Working Group (RWG) Meeting Summary and Action Items

Thank you for your participation and efforts at the MLPA San Francisco Regional Working Group (RWG) meeting held on Monday, September 30, 2002. This memo includes a brief meeting summary and the following attachments:

Attachment A – Roster of Attendees

Attachment B – Upcoming Meeting Dates and Action Item List

Please carefully review the attached Action Item list (*Attachment B, Upcoming Meeting Dates and Action Item List*) to ensure we have included all of the agreed-upon tasks and to identify your work areas. Please feel free to contact me at (503) 228-6111 or at mledesma@resolve.org or Sara Peterson at (650) 631-6759 or at sapeterson@dfg.ca.gov if you have questions or concerns.

I. Welcome, Introductions, Proposed Meeting Objectives and Agenda

The meeting began with the Regional Working Group (RWG) Coordinator, Sara Peterson of the Department of Fish and Game (DFG), welcoming the members and observers. She then asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Michaela Ledesma, Senior Associate with RESOLVE and the RWG facilitator, then briefly reviewed the agenda and MLPA Notebook materials including the Draft Operating Principles and the MLPA Goals. She added that draft meeting summaries will be provided to the Working Group for correction and comment prior to distribution, via the website, to the public. Ms. Ledesma also reviewed meeting process, proposed ground rules, and roles and expectations for the members, staff, and facilitator.

Ms. Ledesma then circulated a list for members to verify or update information on their proposed alternates, noting that all Working Group members had submitted the information prior to the

meeting. Ms. Peterson recognized that alternates have not been formally approved by the DFG Director but indicated that the Department would be working to finalize these as soon as possible.

Next, members were asked to verify or update the contact information made available to the public on a roster. The information will be available on DFG's MLPA website to facilitate interaction with the public. It was noted that a separate hardcopy roster will be maintained with more complete contact information for internal use by the Working Group only. An individual asked about the possibility of having members of the public contact Working Group members through the MLPA website. Ms. Peterson agreed to follow up on the topic with the MLPA Planning Team and report back at the next meeting.

II. Review of MLPA Regional Working Group Goals, Objectives, Mandates and Responsibilities

Ms. Peterson reviewed the MLPA Goals, Guidelines and Roles, also provided in outline format to Working Group members. Following the presentation, Ms. Peterson answered clarifying questions from the group.

- 1) *What is the interaction between the Master Plan Team and Regional Working Group?* Master Plan team is tasked with assisting the RWG in developing its proposed alternatives. They will provide feedback and comment to the RWG. It is anticipated that the interaction between the Master Plan Team and RWG will be an iterative process.
- 2) *When will the pamphlet *The Science of Marine Reserves* be available and will the members receive it?* The Department is working on obtaining copies and distributing them to the RWG in advance of the next meeting.
- 3) *Are we starting the process over again?* Yes, the small group meetings were stopped and the RWG will be used to assist in MPA design. The proposed initial draft concepts for MPA created by the Master Plan Team is not a framework for the RWG to work within. The RWG is free to come up with their alternatives. The Master Plan team will provide comments on those alternatives.
- 4) *How is the group going to be working on mapping reserves? How should we deal with those who don't have access GIS outside the meetings?* It is expected that DFG will be able to provide GIS support at future meetings so that the RWG can work on mapping together as a group. One suggestion for work outside the meetings would be to obtain Mylar copies of maps for Working Group member use.
- 5) *How can the RWG evaluate potential MPA sites (access) for themselves?* It was suggested that the RWG build a list of areas they would want to study. DFG will look in to contacting landowners, or providing access with one of the DFG patrol boats.

III. MLPA Regional Working Group Composition

RWG members were asked to comment on whether the current RWG composition was sufficient to accomplish their goals. In particular, they considered whether there were constituencies not adequately represented by the current membership. After brainstorming, the RWG felt that there were three potential interests not represented adequately. Based on concern about how reserve design would ultimately affect consumers, group members felt that specific representation of consumer interests might be warranted. However, the group could not decide on how to choose a consumer representative and if such a person would commit to the RWG process. Other gaps identified included coastal businesses (such as Chambers of Commerce, restaurants, tackle shops, and other businesses directly and indirectly affected by MPA implementation), and socio-economic expertise.

Working Group members discussed whether the gaps identified could be represented by seats currently at the table, or whether specific expertise could be brought to meetings on an as-needed basis. Although they agreed not to add additional seats at this time, Working Group members will continue to identify specific expertise needed for meetings.

IV. Draft Operating Principles

Ms. Ledesma informed the Regional Working Group that the operating principles are intended to serve assist the group to define how it will govern its discussions, deliberations, and decision-making. She then presented several clarifications to the Draft Operating Principles which were first made at the Santa Barbara/Ventura meeting on 9/18/02, and which will be incorporated in all Working Groups' Operating Principles.

Ms. Ledesma indicated that the goal of the session was to identify issues of concern, incorporate changes into the Operating Principles as necessary, and, if possible, agree upon a finalized document. She noted that if the group had outstanding issues at the conclusion of the session, they would need to discuss this further. Below are brief summaries of the members' comments and/or next steps for each section of the document.

Section One – “Purpose of the Marine Life Protection Act Regional Working Groups”
Section One was approved.

Section Two – “Role of the Regional Working Group Members/Working Group Structure”
Section Two was approved.

Section Three: “Participation”

Working Group members engaged in a brief discussion regarding conflicts of interest and clarifying what it means to act “in good faith,” but agreed not to make any changes or additions to the language as provided.

Section Three was approved.

Section Four: “Meetings”

Open Meetings. Working Group members discussed potential public attendance and disruptive audience members as well as how the Working Group should handle questions and comments from the audience members. It was suggested that rules need to be developed to address this situation.

The members agreed to add language to Section IV, paragraph 1 stating that members of the public may make public comments at the will of the group and as time permits.

RWG members also asserted that their alternates should receive all the information that they receive. Ms. Peterson agreed to work with approved alternates to confirm their preferred means of communication.

Members requested that proposed meeting agenda be circulated two weeks in advance of meetings, and modified the Draft Operating Principles to reflect that request.

Section Four was approved with the agreed-upon changes.

Section V. “Decision-Making and Comments”

Working Group members engaged in a discussion regarding the use of the word “consensus” Several individuals expressed concern about utilizing “consensus” because of its different connotations in legal or other process settings. Overall, group members recognized that consensus still remains the goal to strive for alongside outstanding issues of how the RWG will reach consensus, how it differs from voting, and what to do when consensus cannot be reached. It was also suggested that in this section under that “consensus” be replaced by “concurrence.”

Section V, paragraph 3 was modified to read:

Unanimous Agreement: *When concurrence among members is possible, the Working Group will strive to make decisions by consensus. Concurrence is defined as all Working Group members support the recommendation or decision.*

Section V, paragraph 4 was modified to read:

If the group cannot reach concurrence, members will evaluate the consequences of their disagreement and decide together how to address their lack of agreement including majority and minority reports. The Working Group will ensure that all opinions will be represented to the Department.

Section Five was approved with the agreed-upon changes.

Section VI. “Safeguards”

Section Six was approved.

Section VII. “Process Reminders/Ground Rules”

Section Seven was approved.

Section VIII. “Schedule”

Section Eight was approved.

With no further issues or concerns, the Regional Working Group approved the Draft Operating Principles as amended. Ms. Ledesma agreed to circulate the revised document to the group and confirm their approval at the next meeting.

VI. Learning about Working Group Members’ Hopes and Expectations/Developing a Proposed Vision for Marine Resources within This Region

In order for all members to begin better understanding each others interests, the RWG members were asked to reflect on two questions near the end of the meeting. The first question was why they agreed to accept their nominations and the second was to describe what would make them glad to have participated two years from now, at the conclusion of the process.

Many members highlighted that they decided to participate because the MLPA process offers the opportunity to protect and enhance marine biological diversity; that better protection of marine resources does not have come at the detriment of commercial and recreational opportunities. Other RWG members look to the process as an excellent opportunity to collect much needed baseline information. Group members want to maximize benefits for all interested parties by using sound scientific and socio-economic information in the MPA design process. Sustainable fisheries are a common goal. However, members also expressed concerns about the lack of funding for the MLPA process.

VII. Next Step Tasks, Meeting Summary and Acknowledgments

The next proposed meeting date for the Regional Working Group is Tuesday, November 19, from 9:00 to 4:00 in Santa Rosa. The alternate date would be Thursday, November 21, from 9:00 to 4:00 in Santa Rosa.

The RWG proposed the following agenda topics:

- Get familiar with the San Francisco Region coastline
- Develop framework for decision-making process
- Develop criteria for MPA habitat selection
- Need to know data that will be available

Ms. Ledesma indicated that she will team with Ms. Peterson to develop and distribute a proposed agenda that will be discussed at the beginning of the next meeting. Ms. Ledesma and Ms. Peterson will also draft a next steps memo for distribution as soon as possible in addition to a brief summary of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

ATTACHMENT A
MLPA SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL WORKING GROUP
September 30, 2002

ROSTER OF ATTENDEES

Regional Working Group Participants:

1. Dr. Ben Becker, National Park Service
2. Mr. Peter Bogdahn, Coastal Communities
3. Mr. Curtis Degler, Recreational Diving
4. Dr. Rod Fujita, Environmental Defense
5. Mr. Jeffrey Gunning, City of Point Arena
6. Mr. Mike Higgins, Non-consumptive Recreation/Diving
7. Dr. Steve Morgan, Bodega Marine Laboratory
8. Mr. Jim Salter, Commercial Fishing
9. Mr. Tom Stone, Sonoma Coast Bamboo Reef
10. Mr. Roger Thomas, Golden Gate Fishermen's Association
11. Wdn. Rich Wharton, California Department of Fish and Game
12. Mr. David Whittington, Central California Council of Diving Clubs
13. Ms. Kate Wing, Natural Resources Defense Council
14. Ms. Katie Wood, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Proposed Alternates/Observers:

1. Mr. Dan Wolford, Recreational Fishing, Los Gatos, California
2. Mr. Paul Olin, California Sea Grant
3. Mr. David Yarger, MABB, Sebastopol, California

Department of Fish and Game Staff:

1. Ms. Sara Peterson
2. Mr. Paul Reilly
3. Mr. Ryan Watanabe

Facilitation:

1. Ms. Michaela Ledesma, RESOLVE, Inc.

ATTACHMENT B
MLPA SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL WORKING GROUP
September 30, 2002

UPCOMING MEETING DATES AND ACTION ITEMS LIST

Upcoming Meeting Date	Time	Location
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Thursday, December 12th	9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m. <i>(with working lunch)</i>	State Building 50 “D” Street, Room 410 Santa Rosa, CA

Action Items	Who	When
<p>1. <u>Web Posting of RWG Public Contact Information</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Post information that RWG have approved for public distribution.Check in with absent RWG members to obtain web posting information.	<p>Sara Peterson</p> <p>Sara Peterson</p>	<p>Info posted on DFG website</p> <p>ASAP</p>
<p>2. <u>RWG Alternates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Get proposed alternates into the approval processConfirm preferred means of communication (email, hardcopy) with approved alternates	<p>Sara Peterson</p> <p>Sara Peterson</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>Following approval</p>
<p>3. <u>Document Distribution</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Circulate 2nd meeting notice including confirmed date, time and locationPrepare and distribute September 30th draft meeting summaryDistribute meeting materials, etc. by emailUpdate RWG roster information as provided	<p>RESOLVE</p> <p>RESOLVE</p> <p>RESOLVE and DFG</p> <p>RESOLVE and DFG</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>October 14, 2002</p> <p>As needed</p> <p>As needed</p>

Action Items	Who	When
<p>4. <u>Resource Materials</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute resource materials to RWG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PISCO brochure Maps of coastal parks Research/baseline data on existing areas Information on PFMC closures Oceanic current charts 	DFG	ASAP
<p>5. <u>Public Input/Outreach</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss use of DFG website for public input to RWG Consider DFG support for public outreach to RWG constituent groups (e.g. press releases) 	<p>MLPA Planning Team</p> <p>Sara Peterson (lead)</p>	<p>ASAP</p> <p>By December 12th meeting</p>
<p>6. <u>Operating Principles</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribute revised draft operating principles with redline/strikeout changes for approval at next meeting 	RESOLVE to RWG	At least two weeks in advance of the December 12 th meeting
<p>7. Consider possible opportunities for RWG members to visit proposed and existing reserve sites</p>	DFG, Richard Wharton	Ongoing
<p>8. <u>November 19th Meeting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed agenda topics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approve revised operating principles; “Get to know” your piece of the coast Review major milestones and schedule upcoming meetings Other topics as identified by Regional Working Group members Identify and distribute background materials as appropriate 	RESOLVE and DFG prepare proposed agenda and circulate to RWG	At least two weeks in advance of the December 12 th meeting